CF0000147273

(2)

Amended Petition

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPU

F.F. 19.12.95 M.H. (3) Bl
Hon'ble Sh. S.C. Pandey (J

W.P.NO.3198/1993.

Petitioners- 1. R.S.Sharma, aged about 42 years s/o Shri Ramdhan Sharma, aged about 42 years, Internal Auditor (OJN), Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Hd. off. Raigarh

2. Neelkanth Mukherji, aged about 3 years s/o the late ShrinathMukhe Branch Manager, Raigarh Kshetri Gramin Bank, Branch-Jamgaon, Distt. Raigarh.

3. Pradeep Kumar Pare, aged about 39 years s/o Shri Laxmi Shanker Pare, Officer (MJT), Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Head Office-Raigarh.

4. Ashwini Kumar Kashiv s/o Shyamsunde Kashiv, aged 32 years, Officer, Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Head Office-Raigarh.

5. Sharad Verma, Branch Manager, Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Baramkela, Teh.SarangGarh, District-Raigarh.

29893

9.12.95
Rajendra Tiwari
Advocate

R.to D.R.
19.12

-Versus-

Respondents- 1. Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank through its Chairman Shri K.V.SubbaRao, Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Head Office-Station Road, Raigarh, (MP)

2. Shri Parathlal Meshram, Sr.Manager(Advocate),

3. Shri Pradeep Kumar Mishra, AreaManager

4. Shri Dhaneshwar Sai, Sr.Manager (Accounts),

5. Shri Shatrughanlal Sharma, AreaManager

6. Anjani Kumar Tiwari, Sr.Manager (General Banking).

(Respondents No. 2 to 6 are posted in the Head Office of the Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank, Station Road, Raigarh).

..2..

(B)

Petition Under Articles 226 & 227 of The Constitution of India In The Nature of Breach Of Policy In Regard To Promotions From OJM To Senior Area Manager by The Respondent No.1.

(273)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 3198 of 1993

Petitioners R. S. Sharma and others

Versus

Respondents Raigarh Kshetriya Gramin Bank and others

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Shri Sanjay K. Agarwal, Advocate with Shri Indrasen Sahu, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri P. R. Patankar, Advocate for the respondent No.1.

Shri P. S. Koshy, Advocate for the respondents No. 2, 3, 4 and 6.

ORAL ORDER

(17th July, 2006)

The following order of the Court is passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeks a direction to the respondent No. 1 to promote the petitioners above the respondents No. 2 to 6. It is admitted by learned counsel appearing for all the parties that the Bank has not followed the principles of promotion as laid down by the Supreme Court.

2. Learned counsel appearing for all the parties agree that the issue involved in the present case is squarely covered by the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of **Hargovind Yadav Vs. Rewa Sidhi Gramin Bank and others** (2006 AIR SCW 2822), wherein the Supreme Court held as under:-

"21. The next question that arises for consideration is the relief to be granted. The appellant was first considered for promotion during 1991 and was not promoted, by wrongly adopting the

principle of merit-cum-seniority. The said procedure was found to be erroneous by the single Judge, Division Bench and by this Court. The Bank was directed to consider the case of Appellant for promotion on the basis of seniority-cum-merit. Thereafter, in the contempt proceedings initiated by the appellant, the Bank undertook to comply with the order directing consideration of the appellant's case by the procedure of seniority-cum-merit. But the Bank, again by adopting the merit-cum-seniority method, failed to promote the appellant and promoted third respondent. The procedure adopted by the Bank had been found to be faulty on three occasions by this Court and the High Court, one of which was in the case of Appellant himself. The appellant had been denied promotion for more than 16 years by repeatedly adopting such an erroneous procedure. In the circumstances, we do not think it necessary to drive the appellant once again to face the process of selection for promotion. This Court in Comptroller and Auditor General of India v. K. S. Jagannathan {1986 (2) SCC 679} observed thus:

"There is thus no doubt that the High Courts in India exercising their jurisdiction under Article 226 have the power to issue a writ of mandamus or a writ in the nature of mandamus or to pass orders and given necessary directions where the Government or a public authority has failed to exercise or has wrongly exercised the discretion conferred upon it by a statute or a rule or a policy-decision of the Government or has exercised such discretion mala fide or on irrelevant considerations or by ignoring the relevant considerations and materials or in such a manner as to frustrate the object of conferring such discretion or the policy for implementing which such discretion has been conferred. In all such cases and in any other fit and proper case a High Court can, in the exercise of its jurisdiction under Article 226, issue a writ of mandamus or a writ in the nature of mandamus or pass orders and given directions to compel the performance in a proper and lawful manner of the discretion conferred upon the government or a public authority, and in a proper case, in order to prevent injustice resulting to the concerned parties, the court may itself pass an order or give directions which the government or the

public authority should have passed or given had it properly and lawfully exercised its discretion."

Having regard to the factual background of the case, and having regard to the fact that even under the merit-cum-seniority basis adopted by the bank the appellant had secured high marks and he was denied promotion on the ground that he failed to secure minimum marks in the interview, there is no need to refer the matter for fresh consideration. With a view to do complete justice, in exercise of our power under Article 142 we hereby direct the first respondent bank to promote the appellant as a Field Supervisor, from the date the third defendant was promoted as Field Supervisor and place him above the third Respondent. However, he will be entitled to monetary benefits flowing from such promotion only prospectively, though the pay is to be refixed with reference to the retrospective date of promotion."

3. Accordingly, this petition is allowed with a direction to the respondent No. 1 to promote the petitioner in accordance with the directions given by the Supreme Court in the case of **Hargovind Yadav** (Supra). No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur